HAVLISH PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED MOTION FOR AN ORDER CREATING A COMMON BENEFIT FUND AND AUTHORIZING CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS THEREFROM

EXHIBIT 5

```
1
    17drterc
   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
   SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
   -----x
 3 In re: TERRORIST ATTACKS ON
                                       03 MDL 1570 (GBD)
 3
           SEPTEMBER 11, 2001,
 4
 4
 5
 5
                                         New York, N.Y.
 6
                                         July 13, 2011
 6
                                         12:03 p.m.
 7
 7
   Before:
 8
 8
           HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS
 9
                                         District Judge
 9
10
           HON. FRANK MAAS
                                         Magistrate Judge
10
11
11
            APPEARANCES
12
12
13
13 KREINDLER & KREINDLER LLP
14
         Attorneys for Ashton Plaintiffs
14 BY: JAMES P. KREINDLER
15
15 ANDERSON KILL & OLICK LLP
        Attorneys for Plaintiff O'Neill
16
16 BY: JERRY S. GOLDMAN
17
   MOTLEY RICE LLC
17
18
    Attorneys for Burnett Plaintiffs
   BY: ROBERT T. HAEFELE
18
19
19 SPEISER, KRAUSE, NOLAN & GRANITO
20
        Attorneys for Plaintiffs
20 BY: CHRISTINA M. FRY
21
21
   WIGGINS, CHILDS, QUINN & PANTAZIS PLLC
22
         Attorneys for Havlish plaintiffs
22 BY: TIMOTHY B. FLEMING
23
23 COZEN O'CONNOR
24
        Attorneys for Federal Insurance plaintiffs
24 BY: SEAN P. CARTER
25
         J. SCOTT TARBUTTON
                  SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
```

```
17drterc
 1
             APPEARANCES
 2
 2
    HANLY CONROY BIERSTEIN SHENDAN FISHER & HAYES LLP
 3
         Attorneys for Burnett/Euro-Brokers plaintiffs
 3
    BY: ANDREA BIERSTEIN
 4
 4
    BERNABEI WACHTEL
 5
         Attorneys for Defendant Perouz Sedaghaty
 5
    BY: ALAN R. KABAT
 6
 6
    BANCROFT PLLC
 7
         Attorneys for Defendant Yousef Jameel
 7
   BY: LIZETTE BENEDI
 8
         CONOR B. DUGAN
 8
 9
    CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP
 9
         Attorneys for Defendant Dubai Islamic Bank
10
   BY: STEVEN T. COTTREAU
10
   PATTON BOGGS LLP
11
         Attorneys for Defendant National Commercial Bank
11
12
    BY: MITCHELL R. BERGER
12
13 JONES DAY
13
         Attorneys for Defendant Saudi Bin Laden Group
14 BY: JAMES E. GAUCH
14
    KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL PLLC
15
15
         Attorneys for Defendant Saudi Joint Relief Committee
16
    BY: MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
16
         JEFF HARRIS
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                   SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
```

17drterc

2.3

(Case called)

THE COURT: Let me start out resolving some issues that the parties have raise with the Court for this conference so we can put those aside and see what else we have to address.

First, the things that Magistrate Judge Maas and I have identified that are appropriate to address today. There was a request for entry of Rule 54(b) judgment. I did get the proposed order. I reviewed it. It is my understanding that all parties have agreed to it. I have signed it and am ready to file it. That will be done today.

There also has been identified the motion that was filed by the Bin Laden Group, a motion to dismiss, I believe. As far as we can tell, that is the only open motion to dismiss that was made since the last set of decisions. I will be moving forward to finish that up and go ahead and resolve that motion.

There is also a motion for default against the sovereign defendants. I have read the first set of papers. My understanding is that I was supposed to receive a file today. I don't know if I have received this.

MR. FLEMING: Timothy Fleming for the Havlish plaintiffs. Your Honor, this morning I went to the sealing clerk's office and filed the evidence under seal. So that's been done. I have a courtesy copy in a box here, which I'd be happy to turn over to you forthwith.

17drterc

THE COURT: That would be helpful. I'm ready to move in accord with that. Between now and the next date I'll be moving forward with that, too.

There is an issue that is in dispute with regard to a motion for assessment of damages against defaulted defendants. I discussed this issue with Magistrate Judge Maas and considered the positions of all of the parties. You can further react if you wish to what I decide. This is the way I decided is appropriate to proceed on that.

I'm going to refer it to Magistrate Judge Maas for an inquest on damages. I'm going to allow the plaintiffs to present both their legal theory -- I've read the argument -- both their legal theory and their amounts for damages to Magistrate Judge Maas, have Magistrate Judge Maas review that, issue a report and recommendation to me. You will have the opportunity to present that evidence, and Magistrate Maas will review it and make a report and recommendation to me.

I will review the report and recommendation after giving the parties an opportunity to object to that report and recommendation and oppose entering that judgment either on the basis of the methodology used for determining the damages or based on the amount that is recommended or based on any other argument that the parties wish to make with regard to opposing entering a damages amount. It will give the plaintiff some opportunity to present and lay out that record.

17drterc

2.3

I've seen the numbers already and the methodology requested in terms of the damages and treble damages requested by Federal Insurance and the nature of those damages. But I'd like to have Magistrate Judge Maas review that, put it in a report and recommendation, so there will be no surprises as to the other parties, particularly the defendants.

If you want to argue there is some prejudice to you in terms of entering those judgments, you can articulate that. But hopefully between now and the next time we meet you will have an opportunity to do that.

I will ask Magistrate Judge Maas to give all of the parties more than the regular time to object, maybe a 30-day or 60-day period to object, and allow any defendants who are still pending to submit objections. If you submit the same type of objection, try to make it a representative set of objections rather than individual objections.

After considering all of the concerns and even understanding that there may be both strategic and tactical reasons why the plaintiffs want judgment entered and strategic or tactical reasons why the defendants may not, I will consider not just the substantive arguments with regard to the methodology for determining those damages and the amount of damages but any other prejudice that you think might occur if I were to enter judgment.

Plaintiffs will have a full opportunity to lay that SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

17drterc

2.2

2.3

out and everyone will have a full opportunity to be heard before I determine whether to adopt that report and recommendation and thereby enter a damages amount.

I will allow Magistrate Judge Maas to decide, in whatever manner he deems appropriate, whether or not the papers are sufficient, whether or not the papers that are already submitted are fully sufficient, or whether or not further affidavits or further hearings are appropriate.

Given that method, my initial reaction is -- and it's not a ruling; I am going to let Magistrate Judge Maas determine the appropriateness of that -- but my initial reaction is any defaulting defendant still would have a right to participate in the inquest on damages and to oppose those determinations of damages. Defendants who are not defaulting defendants do not have that right. I will extend to them the right to oppose my either adopting Magistrate Judge Maas's report and recommendation in toto or adopting in any manner that which they find is inappropriate or prejudicial to them.

I want to give all parties an opportunity to do that so you can be confident that you can move forward to establish those damages and you can be confident that you will have an opportunity to be heard before that final decision is made by me as to whether or not to enter that order. You will know fully what the nature of that proposed order will be and rationale for that. I think that is the most efficient and SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

17drterc

2.3

appropriate way to do that considering everyone's concerns and interests.

Those are the main issues that we examined for this conference.

I understand that you have been reporting to Magistrate Judge Maas on the progress of discovery. You can either report where you think you will be at what point in time or we can see where you are or think you will be when we meet the next time.

At this point we should probably go ahead and schedule Friday, January 13th for the next conference. We'll see if we need it. I think the most efficient process has been and continues to be that I should get letters from the parties indicating whether you think we should have that, what issues you think we should address, so I can see if we can address the appropriate issues before the conference and be prepared to intelligently address the issues at the conference.

Those are the issues that I wanted to address in the first instance, knowing that those issues are out there. Now I'll turn to the parties and you can let me know whether or not there are other issues we need to address, whether you have any other suggestions or objections that you have identified in the way we anticipate proceeding. I'll let you continue your discovery discussions with Magistrate Judge Maas right after we finish here so you can continue to make progress in that SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

17drterc regard.

2.3

Let me first turn to plaintiffs. Are there any other issues or reaction to that proposal?

MR. CARTER: Sean Carter on behalf of the plaintiff's executive committees. We are fine with the proposal for Judge Maas to handle the inquest into damages and the related briefings.

Your Honor had mentioned the potential deadline for people to object to Judge Maas's ruling might be extended by as much as 30 or 60 days. The only concern we have is that we do believe the pool of Al Qaeda assets that exist at this moment is very vulnerable to depletion or outright exhaustion as a result of some collateral attack by other parties. We would like an opportunity to address those issues to Judge Maas, and perhaps he can set what he thinks is an appropriate deadline for objections.

THE COURT: That's fine. If you're going to have others have the opportunity to object, you ought to discuss it with each other and try to figure out whether there is an objection, if they have an objection. Frankly, I think 60 days is more time than is appropriate. 30 days is probably a reasonable amount of time, if needed. Magistrate Judge Maas he can make the final determination either way, whether he thinks he wants to keep it on the same regular schedule or extend it out

17drterc

2.3

My initial reaction would be that it might be appropriate to go ahead and send out notice that the parties should object, file objections within the normal period of time. But if they believe that they need a greater period of time, they should request a greater period of time, and that time might be extended automatically as much as 30 days if they needed that extra time. I agree that much more than 30 days might be detrimental to their interests. If 60 days is necessary and reasonable or 14 days is still reasonable, I'll let Magistrate Judge Maas determine that.

I will expect at least a request for a greater period of time than the normal time by the defense and some significant justification if that request is going to be beyond 30 days. I want to give Judge Maas flexibility to deal with it in the way he thinks is appropriate. I will have some flexibility, and all the parties can feel that they will have the full opportunity to be heard appropriately before any final order.

I think you should sit down with Judge Maas immediately to try to figure out on what schedule you want to do this, how quickly you want to do it, give him an opportunity to go through all of the papers to see whether or not the papers are sufficient, if he wants more papers or he wants to hear from you individually further on it or he thinks it is appropriate to bring in some witnesses.

17drterc

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. CARTER: Thank you, your Honor. MR. KREINDLER: Good morning, your Honor. Jim Kreindler for the plaintiffs. Since we haven't all been together for a while, I thought I'd stand up and talk to you for a minute about how do we get to the end of the case and what some of the upcoming developments are going to be, and the matters you touched on affect that. From reading the news, we are all aware that in the last week South Sudan was born. With that happening, I think in the next few months there is a reasonably good chance that the administration is going to take Sudan off the list of state sponsors of terrorism. Sudan is one of the very important defendants in our case for hosting bin Laden before he moved to Afghanistan and then continuing to support him. When Sudan comes off the list, U.S. companies -- oil companies, natural gas companies -- are going to be able to invest in Sudan. When that happens, I, we, believe that Sudan, like Libya, will want to get out of all U.S. litigation. I think there is a reasonable chance that the administration is going to do with Sudan what it did and what Congress did in 2008 with Libya. In 2008 the Libyan Claims Resolution Act was passed that ended all litigation with Libya and all

22 passed that ended all litigation with Libya and all
23 plaintiffs -- Pan Am 103 plaintiffs and all other American

24 plaintiffs -- were paid \$10 million a death, 3 million an

25 injury, and money for insurance and property claims.

17drterc

 If that unfolds as we hope it will in the next few months or the next year, whether it's by January 13th or next year, we may be in a position where Sudan is going to pay a large sum of money and get out of this case and the other cases against Sudan. If that happens, I think that will be an enormously important event and should start a cascade of resolutions with other defendants over time.

We also have Iran. Who knows when Iran's regime is going to change and when Iran might come off the list. But if Sudan pays the kind of money that Libya did, \$3.7 billion, that will start filling up the pot that we need with this formula of 10, 3, and property loss.

I want to comment on the Havlish motion that your Honor addressed. We are very concerned with timing. If a hearing occurs at the wrong time, it will or it could derail resolution with Sudan. In the case of Libya, you may remember that in 2007 a very large judgment was rendered for the six Americans killed in the UTA bombing against Libya. I can tell you from personal experience, having spent two years, that that delayed the resolution with Libya by at least a year or two and nearly killed it.

What the Havlish people want, those 20 plaintiffs, is fine. But we have a well-thought-out strategy for the thousands of death cases, the thousands of injury cases, and the property damage, and we are very concerned with the timing.

17drterc

2.2

2.3

If a hearing there occurs at the wrong moment, it could kill the process with Sudan. So our request --

THE COURT: I'm not quite sure exactly at this point, how I determine what was the wrong moment?

MR. KREINDLER: My request, since we have one of the lawyers in the Havlish case, is that they consult with us, the plaintiffs' committee, before any public hearing. It may not make a difference, but it may be important. And I wanted to talk about these things because the Court is here, Havlish has a representative, the defendants are here.

I should say that this motion we have with Al Qaeda is part of the process. There is no mystery that working on this case without being paid for ten years is not an easy thing for my colleagues and I. We all look at the frozen assets, which isn't that much money. 8 to \$10 million in the context of 9/11 is a drop in the bucket.

But we were able to come up with a formula where, if we are able to recover that money, we can use that to fund expenses going forward. That's why it's important for us. Not that it's going to compensate anyone in an appreciable way, but we want to be able to get that for our clients so we've got a little help over the next few years as these events unfold.

We look forward to doing this hearing soon. I'm hoping that I can convince my colleagues on the defense side that there is no reason to object. By any stretch of the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

17drterc

2.3

imagination, whether the damages on 9/11 are 50 billion or 500 billion, it's a lot more than the 8 to 10 million in frozen assets, and we could use it.

The last thing I'd like to say is I'm glad we have the 54(b) issue resolved, because, as events unfold with Sudan, the appeals can move forward in the Second Circuit and we could be in a position in a year, year and a half, where we know for sure who is in and who is out. And then with the defendants who are left, if we get this done with Sudan, it's before the Court, we've got a methodology for distributing money, and we can really make some progress.

I wanted to talk about this now because ten years is a long time. We do see an end in sight. Thank you for these orders and listening to me for five minutes. I know you have another matter. I wanted to take a few minutes on kind of the long range as we are focusing on each of the trees in the forest. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Not everyone will have necessarily the input on every issue that they want, but I want to make sure that all parties are informed as to every aspect of the progress of the case. If they wish to have some input, they can seek it with the Court or discuss it with their colleagues or object to it. Both Magistrate Judge Maas and I have tried to proceed in a consistent manner in that regard.

Did you want to respond?

17drterc

MR. FLEMING: Yes, your Honor. Timothy Fleming for the Havlish plaintiffs. First of all I want to say Mr. Kreindler's estimates of 20 plaintiffs is incorrect. There are more like 60 decedent estates and representatives of the estates involving some 300 plaintiffs, 300 claimants in the Havlish case, who are every bit as important as however many are represented by other counsel. In fact, we are the ones who actually put forward the evidence regarding sovereign.

Now, if these negotiations or these diplomatic gambits are in play, it is the first I've heard about it. Mr. Kreindler has not seen fit to advise the Havlish team of the existence of it. We would like to talk to them about it and we would like to know about it. We certainly don't think it is a reason to delay the hearing vis-a-vis the sovereign Islamic Republic of Iran, Sudan.

I have been accompanied to court today by Mrs. Ellen Saracini, who is the wife and widow of Captain Victor Saracini, who was the captain and pilot of United Flight 175 that crashed into the south tower. She has come today in hopes of the addressing the Court very briefly concerning her desire and the Havlish plaintiffs' desire to hold a public hearing on the briefings and on the papers and on the evidence that we have submitted to the Court.

It is quite voluminous. If it would be beneficial, if the Court is so inclined, to have one, we could present the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

17drterc

2.2

2.3

essence of it in one day, and we would like to do so before the 10-year marker of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Ms. Saracini has come to court hoping to address the Court very briefly on that subject.

THE COURT: I don't think that is necessary. We already have a process for that. We will immediately discuss with you the efficient process for going forward with that. You have a box that you will be delivering to me today. It should be the last set of papers that I should start to review.

I am committed to moving forward immediately with a hearing in this regard. The question is for me to organize it in a way that it is efficiently conducted in terms of what is necessary to moving forward without getting too extended so that it's delayed.

With regard to the communications among the lawyers, I always say I'm not an interpreter or translator for lawyers, particularly if you're on the same side. Talk to each other. For most of these issues, rather than talking three-way through me, it would be better if you speak directly to each other. Be cooperative in ways that you can be cooperative in that regard.

I respect her attendance here and I welcome it, but I don't want to move off on a tangent in terms of what is the efficient legal process that we are involved in, which I don't think at this point she can assist in other than to, obviously, emphasize to us by her presence her concern and urgency with SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

17drterc

regard to moving forward with a resolution as quickly as we can.

MR. FLEMING: In a previous hearing your Honor had indicated that once we filed the evidence, you would refer the plaintiffs to Magistrate Judge Maas for setting up damages hearings vis-a-vis the sovereign. I wonder if it would be appropriate for us to at least have a preliminary meeting with the magistrate in order to talk about doing that and the timing for that.

THE COURT: Let's do that in the context of the other Federal Insurance damages case. However he decides to organize that, that's going to be the structure. You should have input into that process even though you haven't gotten to that part of the process yet.

If you want to do that at the same time, then discuss that with Magistrate Judge Maas. Particularly to the extent the issues overlap, there is no reason not to give you an opportunity to demonstrate what you claim are the damages on a different track than the hearing to establish the liability claimed under sovereign.

When you meet with Magistrate Judge Maas later, if you want him to either at the same time or shortly thereafter examine the damages with regard to the Havlish plaintiffs, there is no reason that that can't go on at the same time as the Federal Insurance and as the assessment of exactly what we SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

17drterc need to conduct with regard to liability. MR. FLEMING: Thank you, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Anything else from either party? 4 JUDGE MAAS: Because Judge Daniels has another matter, 5 I propose to meet with counsel in a different courtroom. I'm 6 trying to see whether it will be 6A or 20A. Bear with me for a 7 second. Why don't we say it will be in 6A immediately after 8 this. I don't know whether you need a reporter. 9 THE COURT: We'll call up and get another reporter. 10 JUDGE MAAS: Fine. I'll meet with the folks in 6A. 11 THE COURT: Let's continue to make progress. Bring 12 anything to my attention by letter that needs to be addressed 13 from my point of view. I'll see you on January 13th. We'll schedule that at 11 o'clock also. 14 15 (Adjourned) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24 25